

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Krishnaswamy Venkatesh Prasad

Group Art Unit: 2615

Examiner: George C. Monikang

Serial No.: 10/707,671

Filed: December 31, 2003

For: VEHICLE SPEECH RECOGNITION SYSTEM

Attorney Docket No.: 81094727 / FMC 1553 PUSP

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on August 5, 2008, for the above-identified patent application.

VII. ARGUMENT

**A. Claims 36-70 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Over *Everhart et al.* in view of *Stammier et al.***

Claims 36-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Everhart et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,240,347 in view of *Stammier et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,839,670.

**1. Claim 36 Is Separately Patentable Under
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over *Everhart et al.* In View Of *Stammier et al.***

The Examiner relies on claim 11 of *Stammier et al.* to support the assertion that *Stammier et al.* teaches, suggests, or discloses the presently claimed "prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant in audio to input information . . . to disambiguate between a plurality of matching data by prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode." (See, Examiner's Answer, mailed August 5, 2008, pp. 5, first full paragraph). Applicants disagree with such an assertion.

Claim 11 of *Stammler et al.* is presented below for reference:

11. A process according to claim 8, characterized in that a navigation system is informed of a target location (location name, street name) through the input of the letter columns in the "spelling mode," **wherein the beginning of a name is preferably sufficient for the input and wherein the navigation system, if necessary, offers several candidates for selection.**

(See, col. 23, ll. 65 - col. 24, ll. 3, emphasis added)

As exhibited above, the navigation system of *Stammler et al.* offers several candidates for selection in the event the audible signal (e.g., that is indicative of location name and street name) presented by the vehicle occupant is not sufficient for input (or not correctly recognized). The navigation system of *Stammler et al.* is not capable of offering several candidates for selection in the event matching data is determined to exist within system as presently claimed. *Stammler et al.* is concerned with correctly recognizing audible commands (*see* col. 13, ll. 55 and Figure 9 "name recognized correctly" box). *Stammler et al.* does not contemplate taking into account matching data that is found to exist in response to receiving voice commands from an occupant.

Further, the Examiner has failed to address other limitations of claim 36. For example, claim 36 requires "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant in audio to input information . . . to disambiguate between a plurality of matching data by prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data **while in the communications mode.**" (Emphasis added). Applicants require in claim 36 that in "the **communication mode** . . . the vehicle occupant specifies parameters related to a telephone located in a vehicle passenger compartment [.]". The Examiner relies on features associated with *Stammler's* navigation system to demonstrate that *Stammler et al.* teaches the communication mode limitations of claim 36. The navigation system of *Stammler et al.* has nothing to do with the communication mode, let alone parameters related to a telephone located in a vehicle passenger compartment as presently claimed.

For at least these reasons, claim 36 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.*

**2. Claim 49 Is Separately Patentable Under
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over *Everhart et al.* In View Of *Stammler et al.***

The arguments presented in connection with claim 36 apply to claim 49.

For at least this reason, claim 49 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.*

**3. Claim 59 Is Separately Patentable Under
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over *Everhart et al.* In View Of *Stammler et al.***

The arguments presented in connection with claim 36 apply to claim 59.

For at least this reason, claim 59 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.*

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,
Krishnaswamy Venkatesh Prasad

By: /Martin J. Sultana/
Martin J. Sultana
Registration No. 57,739
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 4, 2008

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400; Fax: 248-358-3351